The Big Giancana/JFK Assassination Heist IW 3/10/92

Yup, they wuz robbed! Sam's ungrateful brother and his son, Sam's nephew, who have over their names (St. Martin's Press) the phoniest of all JFK assassination books with the possible exception of Morrow's.

Walking through a supermarket this morning I saw the front-page major headline in The National Examiner that says Marilyn Monroe was killed as part of the JFK assassination assassination by Sam Giancana, by a suppository forced into her rectum-without any traces of bruises while she was held so that could be done.

I skimmed, did not read the story. It is attributed to the derring-do of the sheet's named reporters, as I recall three. It is actually cribbed from either the book or the four excerpts printed by the London Daily Express, which I have.

According to the Express version, Sam Giancana also controlled the CIA.

From the Express version the book seems to be a combination of wholesale thievery from a number of bad, unfactual books, earlier and baseless stories and pure fabrication. If making things up can be pure.

St. Martin's above is wrong. I do not know who the publisher is. St. Martin's did Howard Donahue's impossible account of the accidental killing of JFK by an accidental shot that Secret Service Agent Mickey in fact did not ~~make~~ make. From others who read the book it is wrong on just about everything, including Donahue's one expertise, firearms. (What he says about me in it is false. I've been sent copies of those pages.)

Not being a lawyer, I can see possibly interesting legal complications because when something is made up it is in some, really many ways unique. So, thee "information" in the Giancana's Double Cross is in some ways unique. Including how Monroe was allegedly offed.

It also has an original and entirely false account of the CIA/mafia plot to kill Castro. But that is unique, too. As is its representation that Giancana controlled the CIA.

The spate of palpably false assassination books, all bad in varying degrees ~~is~~ are in some ways worse than this Giancana exploitation, the supermarket-tabloid species of them. (There are others.) Those by the Liftons and the Lanes give the semblance of reality when they are false and unreal. Lifton's and Livingstone's give the appearance of scholarship. Livingstone sometimes crediting prior publication generously and Lifton pretending it all started with him and that he owns the subject, an attitude he took from Mark Lane.

Over the ~~past~~ past several decades, I believe, the attention to such works has been a major factor in the perpetuation of the official mythology of the lone-nut assassin. Along with Oliver Stone, they now have everyone even more confused and have, I believe, further undermined the credibility of legitimate writing (of which I know of none recently) and criticism of the ordained "solution."